

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-6348

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOSE JUAN ORGANES-ESPINO, a/k/a Johnny Organes, a/k/a Johnny Two Braids,
a/k/a Paisa,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., Chief District Judge. (1:09-cr-00263-WO-1; 1:13-cv-00577-WO-JLW)

Submitted: May 25, 2017

Decided: May 31, 2017

Before MOTZ, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jose Juan Organes-Espino, Appellant Pro Se. Sandra Jane Hairston, Robert Michael Hamilton, Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jose Juan Organes-Espino seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and his motion for reconsideration. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Organes-Espino has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED